

Hyland, Dana

From: Ohrel, Sara
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:59 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: fyi

Will do!

From: Fawcett, Allen
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Ohrel, Sara
Subject: RE: fyi

I'm meeting with him at noon on some post 2020 modeling issues, let's talk in my office about the LULUCF stuff as well when it's time.

Thanks,
Allen

From: Ohrel, Sara
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: fyi

Maurice just dropped my cube to say that he will come by later to discuss the LULUCF stuff. He said that he wants us (CEB and CPB teams) to move ahead with our USFS counterparts (as you and I discussed). I plan to just inform him of our plan as discussed yesterday. That ok, or would you like us to pop over to your office when he comes by (he didn't state a time, just after a meeting he was heading off to)?

Sara Bushey Ohrel
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: (202) 343-9712
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Hyland, Dana

From: Murphy, Tina
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 11:09 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: Meeting with Sarah

Hi Allen,

I am in the process of scheduling this meeting, but Paul/Bill are available in the morning on Wednesday, November 6th you are booked for the Nora field trip from 9-1. Not sure what to do now. Sarah's schedule on Wednesday, November 6th is a bit crowded.

Are you still planning to attend the Nora field trip?

Thx, Tina

From: Krieger, Jackie
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 10:44 AM
To: Murphy, Tina
Cc: Kocchi, Suzanne; Friedman, Kristina
Subject: meeting to schedule

Hi Tina. Here is a meeting that we need to schedule with Sarah for next week, after her hearing on Tuesday.

Subject: Post-2020 Discussion

Invite: Paul Gunning, Allen Fawcett, Bill Irving (for scheduling purposes, these are the three key people in addition to Sarah)

Optional: Jackie Krieger, Suzie Kocchi, Kristina Friedman (may be others that CCD can bring along)

Date: Wed Nov 6

Duration: 30-45 mins

Hyland, Dana

From: Hargrove, Anne
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Irving, Bill
Subject: FW: Post-2020 Discussion
Attachments: Post-2020 Discussion .ics

Bill, Allen, I spoke to Tina. She says she can move this meeting to 10 am on Fri. Nov. 8. It's a half an hour long. Would each of you let me know if this time is possible or impossible for you. Thanks, and sorry for the inconvenience. Anne

Anne Hargrove
Climate Change Division, Management Operations Staff
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9926

f - (202) 343-1204

From: [Dunham, Sarah](#)
To: [Gunning, Paul](#); [Fawcett, Allen](#); [Irving, Bill](#)
Cc: [Krieger, Jackie](#); [Kocchi, Suzanne](#); [Friedman, Kristina](#); [Hargrove, Anne](#)
Subject: Post-2020 Discussion
Start: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:00:00 AM
End: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:30:00 AM
Location: DCRoom1310L1002DirTBPoly/DC-1310L-OAR

Sorry, Sarah has a meeting conflict.

Hyland, Dana

From: Irving, Bill
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 11:29 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Hargrove, Anne
Subject: RE: Post-2020 Discussion

Anne – 10am is not ideal for me because of a video conference at the same time, but if that is the only time available I can work around it.

From: Fawcett, Allen
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 10:44 AM
To: Hargrove, Anne; Irving, Bill
Subject: RE: Post-2020 Discussion

Friday at 10 would work great for me. Thanks Anne.

From: Hargrove, Anne
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Irving, Bill
Subject: FW: Post-2020 Discussion

Bill, Allen, I spoke to Tina. She says she can move this meeting to 10 am on Fri. Nov. 8. It's a half an hour long. Would each of you let me know if this time is possible or impossible for you. Thanks, and sorry for the inconvenience. Anne

Anne Hargrove
Climate Change Division, Management Operations Staff
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9926

f - (202) 343-1204

Hyland, Dana

From: McFarland, James
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 5:27 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: Post 2020 modeling capabilities
Attachments: Post-2020 Economy-wide capabilities.pptx

Attachment withheld in full
under Exemption 5-deliberative

Allen – Here's the slide you asked for on post-2020 modeling capabilities. Let me know if it needs additional content. I tried to keep it simple and high level.

-Jim

From: [Gordon, Jessica M](#)
To: [Hyland, Dana](#)
Subject: FW: ADP submission
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 12:35:42 PM
Attachments: [adp_usa_workstream_1_20130312.pdf](#)

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9444
gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

From: Gordon, Jessica M
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:51 PM
To: Sherry, Christopher; Irving, Bill
Subject: ADP submission

I think this is the doc you mentioned, Bill, but please let me know if it's not.

Thanks,

Jessica

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9444
gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

**ADP Workstream 1: 2015 Agreement
Submission of the United States**

- The United States is pleased to have this opportunity to submit further views on the 2015 agreement.
- As a preliminary matter, we note that both President Obama and new Secretary of State Kerry have recently stressed the importance they attach to the climate challenge and measures to address it.
- Turning to the 2015 agreement, we view last year's conceptual discussions as having been extremely worthwhile. It appears that there was quite a bit of convergence on what the attributes of the agreement should be. For example, many considered that it should be "ambitious," "conducive to widespread participation," and "flexible." We think this year should be used to move from such descriptors to concrete ideas for the structure and other features of the agreement to match the descriptors.
- We also need further discussion of what it means for the agreement to be "under the Convention," where views were more mixed. In the U.S. view, the primary implication of being "under the Convention" is that the agreement should further the Convention's objective. Consistent with the Convention, in their actions to achieve the objective, the Parties should be guided by, among other things, the principles set forth in Article 3. Because the principles are therefore means to an end, not an end in themselves, we need to apply them in such a way that they promote ambition towards the Convention's objective in the post-2020 period.
- Noting that we can expect the 2015 package to include pieces devoted to all the well-known elements of the climate regime (e.g., mitigation, reporting/review, adaptation, finance, and technology), in this paper, we focus on the approach to mitigation. It is the main issue that needs updating, as the Cancun mitigation commitments (and Kyoto commitments for those that undertook them) generally do not extend beyond 2020.
- In the U.S. view, a critical lens through which mitigation ideas should be considered is whether they will promote real-world ambition, with reference to the agreed goal of keeping global temperature below a two-degree increase. If the agreement reflects ambition on paper but countries do not join it, or they join it but do not implement it, then it will not be effective in the real world and will not advance the FCCC's objective. If, on the other hand, the agreement attracts countries to join and implement but the level of action is substantially inadequate, then the agreement will also not meet real-world ambition.
- We consider that the agreement should provide for Parties to define their own mitigation contributions, taking into account national circumstances, capacity, and other factors that they consider relevant. A template might be drawn up to reflect a variety of contributions.
- Some might consider it counter-intuitive to say that having Parties determine their own contributions will promote ambition -- because Parties might, left to their own devices, choose low levels of ambition. However, we reach a different conclusion:
 - First, given that Parties are in a unique position to judge their respective situations, they are much more likely to participate in the agreement if they have designed their own

- contributions. Such an approach, in other words, promotes an agreement that is "applicable to all Parties."
- Second, for the same reason, Parties are also more likely to implement their contributions if they have designed them. As noted above, perfect contributions on paper are meaningless if they are not implemented.
 - Third, there are ways to promote ambition even where Parties are designing their own contributions (see below).
 - Finally, we have not seen a better alternative. An approach that imposes contributions from without is neither realistic nor likely to result in wide participation/implementation. It is hard to imagine agreement on any formula or criteria for imposition of contributions, as this would get into the most controversial issues; it is also hard to imagine that Parties would be willing to have other Parties dictate their contributions, even if not based on a formula/criteria, given national sensitivities.
- In terms of encouraging Parties to strive for greater ambition when determining their contributions, the agreement could approach this in a number of ways that are not mutually exclusive:
 - It could encourage ambition by including a consultative period after "draft" contributions were put forward. This would allow each Party to analyze other Parties' measures in light of both comparative effort (allowing consideration of national circumstances and capabilities and other relevant factors) and the overall level of ambition in light of the global temperature goal. The broader public would also have the opportunity to consider draft contributions and offer comment. The timing of such a period and its length would need to be further considered. While there would be no requirement for a Party to iterate its draft contribution in light of the review, the process would likely have the effect of encouraging meaningful contributions in the first instance and might in fact result in more ambitious contributions as a result of reactions from the international community.
 - It could also encourage ambition by including a clarity component. While Parties would have flexibility in designing their mitigation contributions, there will need to be ex ante clarity with respect to the various aspects of such contributions, e.g., scope/timing/stringency/assumptions, etc. Such clarity would both promote understanding of individual contributions and facilitate an analysis of aggregate efforts. As such, mitigation contributions should be put forward in combination with certain types of necessary information.
 - Ambition has to be consistent with the key interests of Parties; at the same time, Parties need to expand the boundaries of their own thinking about what is and is not consistent with such interests. We will not get to where we need to go if countries see climate change as an afterthought.
 - As Parties may not have in place the full range of their post-2020 measures by 2015, and assuming we want to design a structure that can live on beyond whatever initial time period it covers, Parties will need to have the flexibility to update their contributions.
 - By definition, the approach laid out above would reflect differentiation. Mitigation contributions would be expected from all Parties (with the possible exception of the least developed countries), because one cannot otherwise achieve the necessary level of ambition to address climate change.

At the same time, contributions identified by Parties would naturally fall along a spectrum or continuum. Thus, while there would be a common commitment to come forward with mitigation contributions, self-identification of measures would result in self-differentiation consistent with national circumstances, capabilities, etc.

- Ambition also demands transparency in terms of implementation. Parties, as well as the international community, have an interest in knowing whether other Parties are delivering on their mitigation contributions. It helps build the trust necessary for all Parties to continue their mitigation efforts. It also helps the Parties know whether, in the aggregate, they are on track relative to the global temperature goal. For the post-2020 period, we envision a common system of reporting and review that builds on existing tools like the GHG inventory and biennial reports, incorporating necessary degrees of flexibility while ensuring adequate information to understand and measure progress toward the range of mitigation contributions.
- Finally, we are open-minded on the name/international legal form of the instrument, for example, whether it is a "protocol," "agreement," or "implementing agreement." In any event, we consider that the package will likely consist of a hub and spokes, with the "hub" agreement containing core elements and associated "spoke" decisions containing much of the detail. Not only are there existing decisions on many subjects that could be cross-referenced (adjusted as necessary), but it will be easier to update detailed provisions by amending decisions than by amending the agreement per se. This will help keep the agreement operative for a longer time period.

Hyland, Dana

From: Kocchi, Suzanne
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:05 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: meetings tomorrow morning - i am calling in

thx

From: Fawcett, Allen
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:02 PM
To: Kocchi, Suzanne
Subject: RE: meetings tomorrow morning - i am calling in

Here are the slides for the post-2020 briefing tomorrow. I'll be sure we have the call in line open for both meetings.

From: Kocchi, Suzanne
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Irving, Bill; Fawcett, Allen
Subject: meetings tomorrow morning - i am calling in

There are call in numbers for both the biogenic mtg and 9 am and then the post 2020 mtg with Sarah at 10 am. I am going to call in for both. Can you please make sure the line is open?

For Paul his leader PIN is (b) (6) Privacy
For Sarah her leader PIN is (b) (6) Privacy

If the lines aren't working and it is easier, you can also just call me directly at (b) (6) Privacy

Thanks!

From: [Gordon, Jessica M](#)
To: [Hyland, Dana](#)
Subject: FW: ADP submission
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 12:19:21 PM

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9444
gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

From: Sherry, Christopher
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:55 PM
To: Gordon, Jessica M; Irving, Bill
Subject: RE: ADP submission

Yes, that's it.

From: Gordon, Jessica M
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Sherry, Christopher; Irving, Bill
Subject: RE: ADP submission

This is the Oct 2013 submission, which I hope is actually the right one!
Jessica

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9444
gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

From: Gordon, Jessica M
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:51 PM
To: Sherry, Christopher; Irving, Bill
Subject: ADP submission

I think this is the doc you mentioned, Bill, but please let me know if it's not.
Thanks,
Jessica

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

(202) 343-9444

gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

Hyland, Dana

From: Irving, Bill
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Gunning, Paul
Cc: Kocchi, Suzanne
Subject: FW: ADP submission
Attachments: adp_usa_workstream_1_20131017.pdf

FYI – US submission on post-2020 process

From: Gordon, Jessica M
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Sherry, Christopher; Irving, Bill
Subject: RE: ADP submission

This is the Oct 2013 submission, which I hope is actually the right one!
Jessica

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9444
gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

From: Gordon, Jessica M
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 4:51 PM
To: Sherry, Christopher; Irving, Bill
Subject: ADP submission

I think this is the doc you mentioned, Bill, but please let me know if it's not.
Thanks,
Jessica

Jessica M. Gordon
Legal Advisor, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9444
gordon.jessica@epa.gov

This message may contain privileged or other confidential information.
Please do not forward or distribute it outside of EPA.

U.S. Submission on the 2015 Agreement

The United States is committed to playing a leadership role on climate change, both before and after 2020. President Obama recently announced the U.S. Climate Action Plan, which contains a broad range of actions to enhance U.S. efforts toward our 2020 mitigation commitment and beyond.

The United States put forward some initial views on the 2015 agreement in its March submission. Since that time, there has been substantial international discussion, both formal and informal, of these and other ideas. We appreciate the good spirit and openness of such discussions.

We have heard a number of very helpful suggestions, and learned from each other. It is useful to build on this dialogue. To do so, in this submission, we further elaborate certain aspects of the 2015 agreement, in part in response to many useful issues that have been raised by others.

Elements of the Package

Structurally, we see the agreement as being part of a larger package:

- The **agreement itself** will contain core provisions that are designed to stand the test of time. The agreement should, all things being equal, be concise. The more concise the agreement is, the easier it will be to negotiate and complete, and the more understandable it will be for domestic decision makers and constituencies.
- We would see somewhat more detail on mitigation and transparency, given their specific nature.
- Like the FCCC, the agreement is likely to contain a mix of provisions that are legally binding and non-legally binding.
- We should not need to revisit the basic structure of the agreement to account for changing circumstances, or when Parties make new mitigation commitments in the future. Therefore, the structure will need to be sufficiently flexible to account for changing circumstances.

Parties' **specific mitigation commitments**, contained in a side document (such as a "schedule"), would also be part of the package. Such commitments would be nationally determined by Parties and would have gone through the consultative process that we have outlined (and which we further elaborate below).

The package will also include various **COP decisions** that either implement elements of the agreement in greater detail, or address issues more appropriately dealt with through decisions.

Timeline

With particular reference to mitigation commitments, there has been discussion of when such commitments should be in their final form and – working backwards – when they should be put

forward by Parties in draft form. Many countries expect that commitments should be ready by the end of 2015, as part of the 2015 package.

We think it should be possible for Parties to come up with draft commitments by early 2015, in time for a consultative process to take place during 2015:

- Many Parties are already looking across their economies at cost-effective mitigation opportunities.
- For its part, the United States is working now to analyze its opportunities for reducing emissions post-2020. We would encourage other Parties to do likewise.

Parties should intensify their discussions on the timeframe and other relevant parameters of nationally determined commitments. We do not think that these issues need to delay preparation and sharing of draft commitments. Should provisos be necessary in relation to any aspect on which there is a lack of clarity, a Party is obviously free to make such proviso clear.

Mitigation Commitments

In our earlier submission, we advocated an approach to mitigation that relies on nationally determined commitments, and we continue to think that is the approach most likely to lead to greater ambition and participation.

We think ambition and participation will be maximized if each Party can put forward a commitment it deems appropriate and fair for its circumstances and is in a position to implement. Parties are much more likely to participate in the agreement, and to implement their commitments, if they have designed their own commitments to be consistent with their circumstances and capabilities. We believe that ex ante clarity and a public consultative period will provide a significant incentive for Parties to put forward ambitious commitments, because each Party will need to be prepared to justify their commitment to the world.

We understand that there will be variation in type and stringency of commitments among Parties. This is by design, to ensure that each Party is constructing a commitment that reflects its national circumstances and full capabilities.

- Some Parties may choose to have more than one element to their commitment, as a combination of approaches may work best for their circumstances. For example, a Party may put forward a hard cap in one sector with emissions that are easy to project, an intensity target in another sector, and policies in a third sector; together, these would form their commitment. Parties should provide an overall quantum of the reductions that they expect to achieve.
- In addition, while the bulk of a commitment should be quantifiable in terms of expected emissions reductions, some Parties may include elements in their commitments that will reduce emissions, but are not quantified or quantifiable in GHG reductions, such as research and development investments, or a carbon price.
- All elements of a commitment ought to be considered in any overall examination of a Party's commitment.

It is also important that commitments be sufficiently clear that Parties can understand the ambition embedded in the Party's commitment and, to the extent possible, how they affect the Party's emission profile. More details on our proposal for providing ex ante information are provided below.

We do not see an approach based on formulas or involving categories of Parties, particularly categories designed thirty years before this agreement becomes effective.

We recognize the value and importance of an accounting system that applies to all Parties and that provides understanding of Parties' commitments, prevents double counting of international units, and provides assurances that countries are doing what they said they would do. This accounting system should be flexible enough that it can be applied by all countries.

Format of Commitments

We suggest that each Party submit a commitment together with clarifying information, including the ex ante information described below, in a simple format that is easy for a reader to understand. We have provided, at the end of this submission, a notional indication of how this might look.

Ex ante clarity

Given the range of national circumstances among Parties, commitments can be expected to be expressed in a variety of ways (e.g., absolute reductions vs. intensity reductions). As noted, we consider that this is a good thing -- it will encourage ambition and broad participation.

At the same time, there is a legitimate need for Parties to understand each other's commitments, both to be able to analyze them in relation to their own commitments and to be able to look at the aggregate effort being put forward.

The amount of clarifying information that should be provided should strike the appropriate balance between the need for others to understand what is being put forward and the need to avoid imposing onerous burdens on Parties, particularly those with less capability.

We think the following list strikes the right balance, but of course not all of these items will apply to each Party's commitment:

- the base year/period;
- the gases and sectors covered;
- the percentage of total national emissions covered;
- the overall emissions reduction anticipated;
- any use/types of offsets and/or emissions trading; and
- any methodologies/assumptions relating to the commitment.

Some of this information might be part of the commitment itself (e.g., the base year), and some of it would accompany the commitment to provide clarity. In any case, between the expression

of the commitment and the accompanying ex ante clarifying information, all of the information would be available to other Parties and the public.

Consultative Process

We thought it would be useful to describe in greater detail how we see the Consultative Process working. We suggest:

- that Parties would have discussions with each other regarding their respective draft commitments and might encourage those that had not put forward a draft commitment to put one forward;
- that Parties would analyze others' draft commitments both in relation to their own and in light of the global temperature goal;
- that civil society would analyze the draft commitments and make its various views known;
- that independent analytic entities, such as the International Energy Agency and others, might do their own analysis of the commitments in relation to the global temperature goal;
- and that, during the UNFCCC meetings occurring during the consultative process, Parties could ask each other for clarity on the information provided ex ante (or any information that is NOT provided that should have been provided), why they think their actions are sufficient, etc. Sessions would be open to NGOs.

In our view, this period of focus on Parties' draft commitments will incentivize Parties to enter into this process with their best effort. A goal of this process is to encourage what we've called a "race to the top" – that is, a dynamic in which Parties are both comfortable with putting their best commitment forward, and uncomfortable about *not* putting their best effort forward, because they want others to see they are contributing the most they can do to solve the climate problem.

- Others have conceived of the consultative process as a process of iterative negotiation – Parties submit "offers" but are expected to enhance them on the basis of negotiation.
- This is not a dynamic in which Parties really look to determine their best effort in their initial offer, and show how they have done so with others. It is, rather, a dynamic in which Parties may well come forward with the minimum credible level of effort, so as to leave room to move in the negotiations.
- This dynamic is something that we should discourage. It would likely to lead to a lower level of ambition than an approach that encourages Parties to seek to come forward with their best effort.
- Of course, under the approach we have described, the effort may – in the aggregate or in the case of individual Parties – be insufficient. This will come out during any consultative period that allows for a clear understanding of Parties' ambitions.
- If that happens, Parties may come under pressure to revise upward, but it will ultimately be their choice.

Assuming submission of final commitments in late 2015, the consultative process would need to begin relatively early in 2015, probably by around the end of the first quarter.

Transparency

Transparency is one of the primary tools that the Convention can use to enhance ambition. This is for multiple reasons:

- First, transparency lets each Party know what others are doing.
- Second, transparency enhances accountability by requiring Parties to answer to the global community for progress towards the implementation of their commitments, increasing the likelihood that their commitment will be fulfilled.
- Third, transparency also increases the likelihood of Parties fulfilling their commitment by serving a facilitative function.
- Fourth, the act of writing regular reports and conducting regular greenhouse gas inventories requires Parties to take a look across their economies, identify sources of emissions, and identify mitigation opportunities. Reporting thereby encourages additional action.
- Fifth, transparency can be a tool for sharing knowledge and best practices between Parties. Mitigation actions that are noticeably successful in one country may be applicable in another. And only by public distribution of that information will other countries be able to apply those practices.
- Finally, transparency is essential to understanding how we all are measuring up to the global temperature goals.

Much work has been done with respect to transparency before and after the Cancun agreements, so we are not starting from scratch.

For the post-2020 period, we support a single transparency system with built-in flexibility to enable all Parties to participate consistent with their capabilities. We are not expecting everyone to be able to do this perfectly on day one. The experience of Parties over time highlights both the flexibility of the system and the value of learning by doing in improving the quality and availability of information. We are ready to work with Parties that need support in improving their transparency capabilities to help them do so.

Transparency would also apply appropriately to the provision of support. In Doha, developed country Parties committed to a robust and common reporting framework as part of the UNFCCC's Biennial Reports. For the first time, there will be comprehensive data being submitted under the Convention on support, including bilateral and multilateral climate finance, technology transfer and development, and capacity-building. An unprecedented level of detail in the transparency regarding support has been provided in connection with Fast Start Finance. Building on the lessons of this period, we expect to see further improvements in future years, including with respect to the mobilization of private climate finance. As additional Parties begin to contribute to finance, technology transfer, and capacity-building, we expect those Parties to follow the same transparency guidelines as current contributors.

Adaptation

Adaptation is an essential part of a 2015 outcome. All countries will be impacted by climate change. While vulnerability to climate change differs across countries, communities, and even households, all Parties will need to continue to prepare themselves in the post-2020 era for the unavoidable impacts of climate change and enhance resilience in the face of future climate uncertainties.

Adaptation actions help the most vulnerable reduce their exposure and sensitivity to climate change, and improve their capacity to predict, prepare for, and avoid adverse impacts. The costs of preparedness and risk management, for instance, can be far less than the costs of disaster relief and recovery. The World Bank and U.S. Geological Survey have calculated that global economic losses from natural disasters in the 1990s could have been reduced by \$280 billion if just one-seventh that amount were invested in preparedness and risk management efforts.

Adaptation actions are ultimately undertaken at the local level. They will vary from location to location, and their benefits will be felt most directly at the local, rather than the global, level. Each Party will therefore need to continue developing and implementing its adaptation plans and policies in a manner that fits its national circumstances and priorities.

In the post-2020 time frame, in order to effectively prepare for climate change impacts, Parties will need to enhance their efforts to:

- Integrate adaptation into national planning and development processes and policies in a way that is robust under multiple climate scenarios and addresses climate extremes, variability and longer-term changes;
- Undertake assessments of climate change impacts and vulnerability;
- Prioritize action on the people, places, ecosystems, infrastructure and sectors that are most vulnerable to climate change impacts, ensuring that plans and policies are designed with meaningful involvement from all parts of society and that international support is used effectively;
- Understand the costs and benefits of adaptation at the local level;
- Strengthen governance and enabling environments for adaptation, including for comprehensive climate risk management; and
- Monitor, report, evaluate, and learn from adaptation plans, policies and programs.

The 2015 outcome will play an essential role in supporting and enhancing these actions, including by building on the ongoing work in the subsidiary bodies and within existing institutional arrangements, such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework, the Adaptation Committee, National Adaptation Plan process, and the Nairobi Work Program. Such ongoing work can:

- Strengthen linkages with and encouraging actions and support by institutions and organizations outside the Convention, such as those at the regional, national and sub-national levels, like national and local governments, universities, civil society

organizations, intergovernmental organizations, and the private sector. Institutions outside the Convention can contribute much-needed expertise, capacity, and resources to advance work in the areas that Parties identify as critical;

- Support the synthesis of information and knowledge about good adaptation practices from existing resources and the provision of technical guidance on good practices, including on integrating adaptation into national and development planning and policies; and
- Improve national communications so that they can more effectively capture and support national adaptation planning processes. This will facilitate accountability as well as the exchange of knowledge, lessons and good practices.

The United States will continue to provide significant support post-2020 to the most vulnerable countries and communities as a key component of our broader climate support efforts.

All Parties can significantly improve their management of climate risks, and the 2015 outcome can send an important signal for bolder action by countries, international organizations, and sub-national entities on adaptation.

Finance

Significant climate finance will continue to flow after 2020. In the last five to ten years, we have collectively created important new infrastructure for climate finance to support developing countries to reduce emissions, protect their forests, and adapt to the impacts of climate change. We expect the arrangements for climate finance support to grow and strengthen beyond 2020. We have agreed to mobilize jointly public and private climate finance of \$100 billion per year by 2020 in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation, and we are working diligently to mobilize this finance in a real and meaningful way. In addition to scaling up our own range of tools to support climate action in developing countries, the United States has played a leadership role in organizing coordinated work by developed countries to respond to the \$100 billion challenge.

The many multilateral, regional, and bilateral institutions and mechanisms for mobilizing climate finance that either have been or are being put in place before 2020 will continue to develop and evolve beyond 2020. We will continue to build and strengthen the climate finance institutions and processes we have put in place in recent years, including the Green Climate Fund, the Standing Committee, and processes for transparency of finance, as well as the significant complementary institutions and processes that lie outside of the UNFCCC.

Public finance will continue to be important for adaptation and for supporting mitigation efforts in less developed markets, while mobilizing private investment through efficient use of public resources and effective public policies will continue to be a key focus of post-2020 cooperative efforts among middle and higher income countries.

Over the coming decades, trillions of dollars in investment – both public and private – will flow into infrastructure in developing countries. Our collective challenge as governments is to get the incentives right – to implement the right kinds of policies and work to strategically re-orient

these investments into low-carbon, climate-resilient investments instead of high-carbon, unsustainable investments.

We need to build an international climate finance system that provides appropriate forms of support for countries that implement ambitious climate policies as well as enact the enabling policies necessary to attract public and private investment. The appropriate forms of support will vary widely by country and sector, and will include grants, concessional loans, non-concessional loans, risk mitigation instruments, technical assistance, etc.

Promoting finance flows into developing country green infrastructure is a two-way street – efforts to “push” resources into these markets will only be successful if recipient countries enact the enabling policies and regulatory reforms needed to “pull” investment in. If countries build robust investment plans and supportive domestic policies, international and domestic finance will flow to those countries.

We also expect that countries’ status as recipients of– and contributors to – different forms of climate finance will evolve over time.

Party:

Description of commitment, including, as applicable, base year/s	
List, as desired, relevant domestic laws, regulations, etc.	
Major assumptions/ methodologies needed for any commitments not expressed in absolute emission terms	

Clarifying Information

Gases Covered: (indicate all gases that are covered, and/or provide explanation if gases are different for different parts of commitment)
Sectors Covered: (indicate all IPCC sectors that are covered, and/or provide explanation if sectors are different for different parts of commitment)
Approach to Land Sector, if included in commitment (e.g., sectors included; adjustments made, if applicable)
Role of International Units (e.g., Markets or Offsets)
Anticipated Overall National Emission Level in target year
Additional information (as needed to further understand any elements of the commitment)

Description of commitment(s):

Parties would describe what they are committing to (for example, economy-wide target, intensity target, policies and measures, etc.), and any other parameters that are central to the commitment itself, such as the base year. Parties would include all components of their commitment in the description, including any non-quantified components, such as research and development goals.

Relevant Domestic Laws, Policies and Regulations:

Parties would list any significant domestic laws or policies that buttress the commitment and will be relevant to its implementation.

Assumptions/Methodologies for baseline scenario or projection:

For any commitment or elements of a commitment that are reflected in non-absolute terms, Parties would provide some background information on the construction of the projection so that other Parties can fully understand it.

Gases Covered: Parties would check all boxes that apply for their commitment, and/or provide explanation if sectors are different for different parts of commitment.

Sectors Covered: Parties would check all boxes that apply, and/or provide explanation if sectors are different for different parts of commitment.

Approach to Accounting for Land Use Sector: Parties would describe their approach for accounting for Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry (LULUCF) to the extent that the Party will make any adjustments for the purposes of their commitment that will not show up in their greenhouse gas inventory (for example, if Parties will not count “natural disturbances” towards their commitment, Parties would describe, broadly, how they define “natural disturbances”).

Use of International Markets or Offsets: Parties would describe whether they plan on using international units to fulfill their commitment, as well as describing how they plan on avoiding double counting.

Anticipated Overall National Emission Level in Target Year: Parties would make an effort to estimate their overall emissions in the target year. Parties would not be committing to this estimate; the estimate would only serve as accompanying information to fully understand the expected impact of the commitment.

Additional Information: Parties would include any additional information needed to fully understand the commitment.

Hyland, Dana

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 6:53 PM
To: Irving, Bill; Fawcett, Allen
Cc: Kocchi, Suzanne
Subject: Fw: meeting on international climate issues

Bill - can you reach out to Maurice about this.

Looping in Allen as well

Thanks!

From: Dunham, Sarah
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 6:44:57 PM
To: Gunning, Paul; Krieger, Jackie
Subject: Fw: meeting on international climate issues

Fyi, and can someone reach out to maurice and work on putting something together for this?

From: McCabe, Janet
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 11:40:18 PM
To: Atkinson, Emily
Cc: Beauvais, Joel; Goffman, Joseph; LeFranc, Maurice; Dunham, Sarah
Subject: meeting on international climate issues

Emily—could you please set up a meeting for me, Joel, Joe, Maurice and Sarah Dunham (an hour)? Sarah, Maurice—Joel, Joe and I agreed today that it would be good for me and Joe to get a better understanding of some of the key international climate issues coming up, including the post 2020 discussions.

Thanks.

Hyland, Dana

From: John Weyant [weyant@stanford.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 1:57 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Allen:
Call (b) (6) Privacy at that time or I can call you.
Best,
John

At 01:08 PM 11/26/2013, you wrote:

>Great, I'll call you then.

>

>Allen

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: John P. Weyant [<mailto:weyant@stanford.edu>]

>Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 3:22 PM

>To: Fawcett, Allen

>Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

>

>Allen:

>Noon EST works.

>Thanks,

>John

>

>At 12:18 PM 11/26/2013, you wrote:

> >John, I'm free 11-1 EST (8-10 PST) tomorrow, let me know if there is

> >a time in there that works for you.

> >

> >Allen

> >

> >-----Original Message-----

> >From: John Weyant [<mailto:weyant@stanford.edu>]

> >Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:58 AM

> >To: Fawcett, Allen; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V

> >Subject: Re: White House EMF 27 briefing

> >

> >Allen:

> >Could you stay on after the call today (or tomorrow) to discuss?

> >Thanks,

> >John

> >

> >

> >At 07:00 AM 11/26/2013, Fawcett, Allen wrote:

> > >Hey everyone,

> > >

> > >I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and

> > >given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020

> > >target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF

> > >22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for

> > >State, and they were very interested in setting up something

> > >similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27

> > >results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up
> > >something for early December.
> > >
> > >Do you think that this is something that would be possible and
> > >worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting?
> > >Is this something we could do with just the local members of the
> > >steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go
> > >that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me
> > >know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should
> > >probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for
> the WH folks.
> > >
> > >Thanks,
> > >Allen
> > >
> > >_____
> > >Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
> > >Climate Economics Branch
> > >Climate Change Division
> > >U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
> > >Office: (202) 343-9436
> > >Cell: (b) (6) Privacy
> > >
> > >
> > >Professor John P. Weyant
> > >Department of Management Science and Engineering Huang Engineering
> > >Center
> > >475 Via Ortega, Room 260
> > >Stanford University
> > >Stanford, CA 94305-4121
> > >Tel: 650-723-3506
> > >Fax:650-725 5362
> > >email: weyant@stanford.edu

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax:650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Hyland, Dana

From: Edmonds, James A (Jae) [jae@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen; John Weyant; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I'm available.

jae

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 1:31 PM
To: John Weyant; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose; Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee

came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Hyland, Dana

From: Rose, Steven [srose@epri.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 3:13 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen; John Weyant; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hi Allen,

Wonderful to hear of their interest in the study. Thank you for bringing it to their attention, and for reaching out to all of us.

I've completed the doodle poll and look forward to chatting with you and the group.

Happy Thanksgiving everyone!
Steve

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 1:31 PM
To: John Weyant; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Rose, Steven; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4ugkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM

To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant

Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Hyland, Dana

From: John Weyant [weyant@stanford.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Rose, Steven; Fawcett, Allen; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Steve:

Many thanks. For some reason it didn't change to PST, but thanks to your tip I changed it to EST.

Thanks,
John W.

At 12:56 PM 11/27/2013, Rose, Steven wrote:

John,

It defaults to Pacific times when you first open it up. You should be able to change it off to the right above the availability entries (not that you need to).

Steve

From: John Weyant [<mailto:weyant@stanford.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 3:53 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Rose, Steven; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Allen:

I will fill out assuming these are DC times
John

At 10:30 AM 11/27/2013, Fawcett, Allen wrote:

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax: 650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Hyland, Dana

From: John Weyant [weyant@stanford.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 4:04 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: Re: White House EMF 27 briefing

Allen:

I filled it out but the noon to 2 PM slot EDT is a tentative hold and I may ultimately be free then.

Thanks,
John

At 12:59 PM 11/27/2013, you wrote:

Tried to set it up so the times are 12-5 EST.

From: John Weyant <weyant@stanford.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2013 3:53:02 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Allen:

I will fill out assuming these are DC times
John

At 10:30 AM 11/27/2013, Fawcett, Allen wrote:

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the

technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM

To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant

Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax: 650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260

Hyland, Dana

From: Geoffrey Blanford [(b) (6) Privacy]
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 11:58 AM
To: 'John Weyant'
Cc: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

John - Thanks for the invitation. I will be back in Munich on Dec 20, but I'll be happy to join the call on the 6th.

Best,
Geoff

From: John Weyant [mailto:weyant@stanford.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 5:52 PM
To: Geoff Blanford
Cc: Fawcett.Allen-epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Fwd: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hi Geoff:
It just occurred to me that you may be in DC on Dec 20th.
If so, it would be great if you could join this briefing.
Also, Allen has set up a call for 3 PM EST on Friday Dec 6
to discuss this plan.
All best,
John

From: "Fawcett, Allen" <Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>
To: John Weyant <weyant@stanford.edu>, "L. Clarke" <leon.clarke@pnl.gov>,
"Calvin, Katherine V" <katherine.calvin@pnnl.gov>, Steve Rose
<srose@epri.com>, Jae Edmonds <jae@pnl.gov>

Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing
Thread-Topic: White House EMF 27 briefing
Thread-Index: Ac7quENQZvnYM37sTly/zAnVn3uyUwABlHdgADf3fPA=
Date: Wed, 27 Nov 2013 18:30:55 +0000
Accept-Language: en-US
X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

x-originating-ip: [134.67.6.11]
x-forefront-prvs: 004395A01C
x-forefront-antispam-report:

SFV:NSPM;SFS:(17033001)(164054003)(51444003)(199002)(189002)(76104003)(53754006)(377454003)(59766001)(54356001)(53806001)(74876001)(47976001)(4396001)(50986001)(15975445006)(76482001)(69226001)(19609705001)(85306002)(15202345003)(77982001)(74316001)(51856001)(79102001)(81542001)(74706001)(81686001)(81342001)(19300405004)(74366001)(63696002)(2656002)(19580395003)(19580405001)(80976001)(49866001)(83322001)(47736001)(81816001)(16236675002)(87936001)(15395725003)(56776001)(31966008)(83072001)(18717965001)(54316002)(2171001)(74662001)(65816001)(74502001)(33646001)(46102001

) (56816003) (77096001) (76786001) (76576001) (76796001) (87266001) (80022001) (47446002) (66066001) (24736002); DIR:OUT; SFP:; SCL:1; SRVR:BY2PR09MB048; H:BY2PR09MB046.namprd09.prod.outlook.com; CLIP:134.67.6.11; FPR:; RD:InfoNoRecords; A:1; MX:1; LANG:en; X-OriginatorOrg: epa.gov

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax: 650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Hyland, Dana

From: John Weyant [weyant@stanford.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 12:00 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Allen:

Do you have a sense of what the WH folks are interested in?
Constraints, inc. NKF, Timing, individual technologies, land use,
costs, etc, etc?
John

At 08:37 AM 12/2/2013, you wrote:

Great, we should certainly include Geoff if he's available, and let him know about the call on Friday. We just saw each other at our 20th High School reunion, but didn't quite have time to talk about EMF 27, or I would have checked with him directly.

Thanks,
Allen

From: John Weyant [<mailto:weyant@stanford.edu>]
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Allen:

Based on our conversations at the ADVANCE meeting
it looks like Geoff may be in the US or even in DC
on the 20th. Should I check with him or does that just complicate things too much.
Thank,
John

At 06:05 AM 12/2/2013, you wrote:

Looks like Friday Dec. 6 from 3-4 EST works for everyone. I'll send out a call-in number later this week.

Thanks,
Allen

At 10:30 AM 11/27/2013, Fawcett, Allen wrote:

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get

this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Gunning, Paul

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 7:08 AM
To: Irving, Bill
Cc: Kocchi, Suzanne
Subject: Post 2020

Bill - there is a meeting set for Friday afternoon at the WH on the post 2020 discussion that I will be attending with Joe. Could you please put down some thoughts/options on what we might want to advocate for in this discussion? Hopefully we can discuss this more at our weekly this afternoon

Thanks

Paul

Gunning, Paul

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 5:33 PM
To: Hargrove, Anne
Subject: FW: Post 2020 meeting postponed until 12/17

-----Original Message-----

From: Goffman, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 5:03 PM
To: LeFranc, Maurice
Cc: Gunning, Paul; Dunham, Sarah; Browne, Cynthia
Subject: Post 2020 meeting postponed until 12/17

Gunning, Paul

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 8:27 AM
To: Murphy, Tina
Cc: Krieger, Jackie; Dunham, Sarah
Subject: FW: Post 2020 meeting postponed until 12/17

Tina - I wanted to make sure you saw this.....

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: Goffman, Joseph
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 5:03 PM
To: LeFranc, Maurice
Cc: Gunning, Paul; Dunham, Sarah; Browne, Cynthia
Subject: Post 2020 meeting postponed until 12/17

Hyland, Dana

From: Calvin, Katherine V [Katherine.Calvin@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:07 PM
To: Rose, Steven; Edmonds, James A (Jae); Fawcett, Allen; 'John Weyant'; Clarke, Leon E
Subject: Re: White House EMF 27 briefing

I can do either, but will need to leave by 4:45.

Kate

From: <Rose>, Steven Rose <srose@epri.com>
Date: Friday, December 6, 2013 1:00 PM
To: "Edmonds, James A (Jae)" <jae@pnnl.gov>, "Fawcett, Allen" <Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>, John Weyant <weyant@stanford.edu>, Leon Clarke <leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>, Katherine V Calvin <Katherine.Calvin@pnnl.gov>
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I can go later. Unfortunately, not earlier.

Steve

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----

From: Edmonds, James A (Jae) [jae@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:53 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: Fawcett, Allen; John Weyant; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; Rose, Steven
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Any chance we could move this to either 2:30PM EST or 4:00PM EST? Our colleague (b) (6) Privacy is retiring today and his retirement ceremony is at 3:00PM EST. Sorry for the late request, but we just realized that we had this conflict.

jae

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; John Weyant; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose; Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Here's the call-in info for our call this afternoon:

Call in #: (b) (6) Privacy
Conference code: (b) (6) Privacy

Allen

From:Fawcett, Allen
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 9:05 AM
To: 'John Weyant'; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Looks like Friday Dec. 6 from 3-4 EST works for everyone. I'll send out a call-in number later this week.

Thanks,
Allen

At 10:30 AM 11/27/2013, Fawcett, Allen wrote:

Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

I've talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something

similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax: 650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Hyland, Dana

From: Edmonds, James A (Jae) [jae@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:40 PM
To: John Weyant; Rose, Steven; Fawcett, Allen; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

In that case I don't think we can move the call. So, let's stick with 3:00 PM EST.

jae

From: John Weyant [mailto:weyant@stanford.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Rose, Steven; Edmonds, James A (Jae); 'Fawcett, Allen'; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I can go earlier but not later
John

At 10:00 AM 12/6/2013, Rose, Steven wrote:

I can go later. Unfortunately, not earlier.

Steve

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----

From: Edmonds, James A (Jae) [jae@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:53 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: Fawcett, Allen; John Weyant; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; Rose, Steven
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Any chance we could move this to either 2:30PM EST or 4:00PM EST? Our colleague (b) (6) Privacy is retiring today and his retirement ceremony is at 3:00PM EST. Sorry for the late request, but we just realized that we had this conflict.

jae

From: Fawcett, Allen [mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; John Weyant; Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose; Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Here's the call-in info for our call this afternoon:

Call in #: (b) (6) Privacy
Conference code: (b) (6) Privacy

Allen

From: Fawcett, Allen
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 9:05 AM
To: 'John Weyant'; L. Clarke; Calvin, Katherine V; Steve Rose; Jae Edmonds
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

Looks like Friday Dec. 6 from 3-4 EST works for everyone. I'll send out a call-in number later this week.

Thanks,
Allen

At 10:30 AM 11/27/2013, Fawcett, Allen wrote:
Hi Everyone,

So the White House (CEA, CEQ, NEC mainly) is interested in a briefing on EMF 27. John and I had a chat today, and we thought that we probably will be able to cover this with John and those of us from the steering committee that are local. The briefing is tentatively set for a December 20th. I wanted to see if we could get this group together for a call next week to discuss a bit more about what the WH is interested in, what we should present, who should be there, and who should do the presenting. Please fill out the doodle poll below to see if we can find a time next week to chat.

<http://doodle.com/am4uqkthxv9sfbtw>

Best,
Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [mailto:leon.clarke@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: RE: White House EMF 27 briefing

I think it's an excellent idea. I am on the steering committee, but really not all that on top of it except for the technology overview stuff. I think that Kate and Jae from the PNNL side would both be good, although I would be happy to come as well – might even insert myself.

> John is obviously totally on top of all of it.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E; Calvin, Katherine V; John Weyant
Subject: White House EMF 27 briefing

Hey everyone,

Iâ€™ve talked to some of my White House colleagues about EMF 27, and given the current state of discussions about the U.S. post-2020 target, they very interested in the study. I mentioned that for EMF 22, some of the steering committee came in and gave a briefing for State, and they were very interested in setting up something similar for some of us to come in and give a briefing on the EMF 27 results to various EOP offices. Ideally, they would like to set up something for early December.

Do you think that this is something that would be possible and worthwhile? If so, who all should we try to bring in for the meeting? Is this something we could do with just the local members of the steering committee? Do we have overview presentations ready to go that are pitched at the appropriate policy maker level? Let me know what you think, if we want to move forward with this we should probably set up a doodle to see what times we can suggest for the WH folks.

Thanks,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax: 650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Professor John P. Weyant
Department of Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center
475 Via Ortega, Room 260
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4121
Tel: 650-723-3506
Fax: 650-725 5362
email: weyant@stanford.edu

Hyland, Dana

From: Irving, Bill
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:55 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Subject: FW: Background for post-2020 discussion

Allen – this was a stream of consciousness email I sent to Paul a couple of weeks ago. Please feel free to supplement/edit and resend to Paul.

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Irving, Bill
Subject: Re: Background for post-2020 discussion

Thanks Bill. I just got an email from Joe that the meeting was bumped to the 17th. Thanks for pulling this together on such short notice. I will take a look and we can discuss next week

Have a great weekend!

From: Irving, Bill
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2013 5:54:19 PM
To: Gunning, Paul
Subject: Background for post-2020 discussion

Paul – Here are some ideas, based on the conversation we had at our weekly. I didn't get a chance to share this with Allen unfortunately.

Background: the Durban process will require all Parties to submit their draft/proposed "contributions" in early 2015, followed by a period of consultation, Qs and As, and then completion of a global agreement in late 2015. It's not clear what the nature of the agreement will be (legally binding?), or how much is locked in vs. creating a timetable afterward to work out more details.

(b)(5) Deliberative

- (b)(5) Deliberative
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

(b)(5) Deliberative

- (b)(5) Deliberative
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

Gunning, Paul

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Dunham, Sarah
Subject: RE: Background for post-2020 discussion

No problem

From: Dunham, Sarah
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 12:07 PM
To: Gunning, Paul
Subject: Re: Background for post-2020 discussion

Thx--can you bring me a hard copy this afternoon?

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:06:22 PM
To: Dunham, Sarah
Subject: Background for post-2020 discussion

Sarah –

I realize you are on you BB today so I have included this text below. As I mentioned yesterday, I asked Bill to pull together some thoughts on the the issues that are likely to come up at some point in this discussion. This is not a complete strategy of what we want to see as an outcome, but rather a starting point to frame our thinking. I think one

(b)(5) Deliberative

Paul

Background: the Durban process will require all Parties to submit their draft/proposed "contributions" in early 2015, followed by a period of consultation, Qs and As, and then completion of a global agreement in late 2015. It's not clear what the nature of the agreement will be (legally binding?), or how much is locked in vs. creating a timetable afterward to work out more details.

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

- (b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

- (b)(5) Deliberative

(b)(5) Deliberative

- (b)(5) Deliberative

Hyland, Dana

From: LeFranc, Maurice
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:31 PM
To: Gunning, Paul; Fawcett, Allen; Krieger, Jackie; Dunham, Sarah
Subject: RE: EEOB meeting

I think we have a van for carpool so plenty of room. Van is reserved for 3:30 by the shuttle pick up or we will see you on the 5th floor.

From: Gunning, Paul
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 12:09 PM
To: LeFranc, Maurice; Fawcett, Allen; Krieger, Jackie; Dunham, Sarah
Subject: RE: EEOB meeting

Yes, I will join you if that is ok as I have a meeting down at WJC

From: LeFranc, Maurice
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:59 AM
To: Gunning, Paul; Fawcett, Allen; Krieger, Jackie; Dunham, Sarah
Subject: EEOB meeting

Are you coming down here to ride over with us for the post-2020 meeting or should we meet you there?

Maurice N. LeFranc, Jr.
Senior Advisor for International Climate Change
Office of Air and Radiation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office Phone: 202-564-1813
Mobile: (b) (6) Privacy

Hyland, Dana

From: Hargrove, Anne
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 1:21 PM
To: Irving, Bill
Subject: FW: Post 2020 Strategy

Bill, Emily added you to the Post 2020 Strategy meeting w/ Janet at Noon on Thursday Jan. 16. Anne

From: Atkinson, Emily
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 1:00 PM
To: Hargrove, Anne
Subject: RE: Post 2020 Strategy

Added

From: Hargrove, Anne
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 12:54 PM
To: Atkinson, Emily
Subject: FW: Post 2020 Strategy

Hi Emily,

Would it be possible for you to add Bill Irving to this meeting. He is chief of the Climate Policy Branch in the Climate Change Division. Thank you and happy New Year! Anne Hargrove

Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 343-9926

Hyland, Dana

From: Clarke, Leon E [Leon.Clarke@pnnl.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 1:49 PM
To: Edmonds, James A (Jae); Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: Post-2020 modeling

And mine. Talk to you guys then.

Leon

From: Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 7:34 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen; Clarke, Leon E
Subject: RE: Post-2020 modeling

It's on my calendar.

jae

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 9:53 AM
To: Clarke, Leon E
Cc: Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: Post-2020 modeling

2 pm (EST) Thursday sounds great.

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:Leon.Clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 12:45 AM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Cc: Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: Post-2020 modeling

Let's do Thursday at 2:00 your time. I may be otherwise engaged at noon EST today.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 10:29 PM
To: Clarke, Leon E
Cc: Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: Post-2020 modeling

Hey Guys,

I'm free tomorrow morning between 10 and noon, or Thursday afternoon 2 to 5 (EST), let me know if there is a time in there that works for you guys. The attached ppt file (close hold) sketches out some of the key analytic questions for the post-2020 discussion broadly, and might be useful for thinking about how best to proceed.

Allen

From: Clarke, Leon E [<mailto:Leon.Clarke@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 2:18 PM
To: Fawcett, Allen
Cc: Edmonds, James A (Jae)
Subject: RE: Post-2020 modeling

Hi Allen,

Jae and I just tried to call you, but I think we left a garbled message on your phone.

Tomorrow sometime would be fine, or sometime on Thursday afternoon. I am on CET time (in the Netherlands) at an IPCC meeting, so a conversation in the evening sometime for me would be best.

We match patch Jae in as well if that works, since he talked a bit with Trigg. Trigg has talked about coming out to chat with us about this as well. So there is a bit of triangulation going on.

Leon

From: Fawcett, Allen [<mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 6:00 PM
To: Clarke, Leon E
Subject: Post-2020 modeling

Hey Leon,

Just wanted to check in with you on the post-2020 modeling work to see if you've started thinking about study design, scenarios, etc. The WH is asking us to scope out the analytic tasks our agency can contribute to by the end of the week, and it would be good to harmonize what we suggest with the modeling we'll do in conjunction with your task with Jonathan. Let me know if you've started thinking about this, or if it would be useful to set up a quick call later this week.

Best,
Allen

Allen A. Fawcett, Ph.D.
Climate Economics Branch
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9436
Cell: (b) (6) Privacy